897

G. R. S. IX-5

Previous references. 1897-98

192

(L.R)

File No. 121897

Serial Nos. 1—25

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—25

Major ~~Part~~ B for January 1902.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Subbaramaiah Shanbhog of Hennagara Village Arkalgud Taluk

---

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

RD

Rec 17/1 45

Send a copy of this
just for information
and file

1/2/98

Write to the Reg

2/2/98

Drafted

4/2/98

Letter No. 1021/85 dated 17th August 1938
from the Registrar of the District
Court of Mysore, enclosing the
records in Civil Suit No. 73 of 1936-37
on the file of the Sub Judge of
Bangalore.

× 83-6-87.

Exhibit A :- This is a kabala
executed to Ramachandriya the
Nagathya Shanbhag of Kumagara
Khane by Krishnabhatta the Batta
Shanbhag of the village, wherein
the latter agreed to look after the
whole Shanbhagi of the Khane
on condition of his paying to the
former one-half of the Inam allowance
(Inamu Kadiya Hanu). Under
the Shanbhagi office keeping the
other half for himself. That even
after the settlement arrived at
& would be fixed he would
continue to give the former one-half
of the pay allowed to him and
that if he failed to adhere to the
condition the former would be
competent

competent to resume the office
from the latter and continue
the same allowance to him (latter).

Exhibit B is an undertaking × 8 2·7·87.
given to Ridarangari Ramaswamy
by the Byconth, Rangachar stating
in reply to his petition - Sl. 4,
and runs as follows:- "Your petition
praying that the Kandigi of the
above Kshane might be registered
in your said name and work
taken from him, and the Amildar's
report - Sl. 2 & were gone through.
Ramaswamy whom you had
appointed as your Gumasta
did not attend to the duties properly
and absented, after entering into certain
revenue collections of this marriage.
Thereafter you were asked have
not appointed a Gumasta in his
place though you were asked to do
so, nor have you been attending
to the work. As such work has
thus been stopped, investigation the
Kandigi allowship of the village, is
hereby to the Kandigi, having
been appointed to perform the work

14

recommended
been ~~rejected~~ by the Guildhall the
competent and willing to do the
duties as Gumasta, orders were
issued ~~after~~ accordingly
As regards your request to have
the registry made in your son's
name and take work from him
one man cannot do the duties
of the village as well as of the
Bidiagere ~~other~~ villages ~~which~~
the Mandalagi of which also you
hold, as these are far from the
former. But however there is
no objection to make the
registry in your sons name.
Orders are accordingly issued to
register the Gumastadarship
Mandalagi in your son's name
and take work from him
as the Gumasta. There are no
grounds to alter this."

16-8-91

"Enclosed is the document
granted to Subbiramaya of
Kumaragiriana from the
Amani

Devaram office informing him that he cannot be allowed to have charge of both the villages, that there is no reason for disturbing the existing arrangement for the performance of the work, as from enquiry it appeared that the Registered Kirthanyfa had been paying the Appellant a share in the Pattys allowance in accordance with the agreement entered into with his father. The appeal was therefore rejected.

Exhibit I is an endorsement granted by the Chief Auditor to Kirthanyfa informing him that orders had been received appointing him Pungunarta and directing him to take charge & do the work, and continue to give the Nirvan allowance to Kumarasinga in the same way as the latter used to give it to the former.

23.6.87.

Bleu
31/8.

6

Before the Government of Mysore.

Petition ~~Appeal~~ No. 865 of 1897-98.

~~Appellant.~~	Vs.	~~Respondent.~~
Petitioner		Counter Petitioner
Krishnappa		Subbaramaiya.

Dispute regarding the Shanbhogi of Hennagaruhalli in the Arkal Taluk.

Posted to the 5th August
Subject 5th Consulted
29/7/98 9407
Comm[illegible]
Please report some facts
& file and take action?
AM
29.7.98
30/7/98

Submitted
Parties not appeared
(2) Issues not framed
not produced
BK
8/10/97

Ad hear & produce
of the Sub Judge's decree
21/10/97

Endorsed
Decision
Reserved
Rs 25-12-0
Rs 12-8-0
23-10-97

1 R. 121-17-1

25 1897 (19)

No. 865

Name of Petitioner ~~Shet~~ Krishnappa
Shanbhog

Village Anaru
Hirasavaradakere

Taluk Anekal (Assam Samata

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 23-9-97

Date of Receipt 24-9-'97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT.

States that the above
land had title the grants
wet lands below it to the
extent of 4 oo candies, a
had, for that reason, ~~the~~ the
bhogs, viz. the Nagara and
the Batai; that of these
two kinds the Petr is the
Batai Shanbhog while
one Subbaramanya is the
Nagadi Shanbhog;-

that the latter's father
alias Shanbhoge
was found fault in 1887
and the Petr appointed
(in his stead
Nagadi Shanbhoge as by
the

that on the ground that Subbramanya's name was to be found in the Shanbhogi-register the said Subbramanya was able to obtain a ~~decree~~ decree in his favour; that this decree of the Sub-Judge of Bangalore was confirmed in the Chief Court;

that that a revenue-case should be settled in a Civil-Court is anamolous;

and that his complaints many attend to the Survey Dept. and to the District Office were without any effect.

Pray that the said Subbramanya's name may be struck off the register agreeably to the Govt. order, - and that there is such an order - prohibiting 2 Shanbhogs for one village; that the execution of the Civil decree may be restricted; - that an order may be passed after perusal of the old records along with the references which he will hereafter submit.

7/10/97

37 1897

No. 1151

Name of Petitioner Krishnappa Shanbhag

Village Shemiagaidalcai

Taluk Chelkal

District Bijapur

Date of Arzi 4-11-97

Date of Receipt 4-11-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosures Nil

ABSTRACT.

[illegible] reference to Endt No 865 dated 2-10-97 relating his petition, begs to submit herewith the decision of the Subordinate Judge in civil suit No 73/96-97 as requested therein.

5/11/97

23 OCT. 97

Bldg No. 1157

1157.

ಕಲಂ 279, 304(ಎ) ಐಪಿಸಿ ಮತ್ತು 187 ಐಎಂವಿ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ದಾಖಲಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ತನಿಖೆ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಮೃತ ಪಟ್ಟವರ ಶವವನ್ನು ಮರಣೋತ್ತರ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮೃತ ಪಟ್ಟವರ ಮರಣೋತ್ತರ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಡಾ|| ಸಂಜೀವ ಕುಮಾರ ಎಂ.ಬಿ.ಬಿ.ಎಸ್. ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಸಿರವಾರ ಇವರು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮೃತ ಪಟ್ಟವರ ಶವವನ್ನು ಅವರ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಕರಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮೃತ ಪಟ್ಟವರ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಕರು ಯಾವುದೇ ದೂರು ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಲಿಖಿತವಾಗಿ ಬರೆದುಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಗೊಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಅಪಘಾತಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾದ ಲಾರಿ ನಂ. ಕೆಎ-36/ಎ-1911 ಅಶೋಕ ಲೈಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಲಾರಿಯು ಅಪಘಾತ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದ್ದು ಅದರ ಚಾಲಕನು ಓಡಿ ಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಸದರಿ ಲಾರಿಯ ಚಾಲಕನ ಹೆಸರು ವಿಳಾಸ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸದರಿ ಲಾರಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು ವಿಳಾಸ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸದರಿ ಲಾರಿಯ ಚಾಲಕನು ಲಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಅತಿವೇಗ ಮತ್ತು ನಿಷ್ಕಾಳಜಿತನದಿಂದ ಚಲಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಅಪಘಾತಪಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಸದರಿ ಲಾರಿಯ ಚಾಲಕನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿ ಸದರಿ ಲಾರಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Nr. 865

Bayerisches Kriegsarchiv
Nr. 24-9-45
Geheim
Abschrift
erfolgreich

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

References

7/98

1157 of 97 Encl

Refer last up.

L.R. 121-97-3

L.R. 7-2-98-13

Secretariat reference to —
a
order complete 1157 of 1897

Petn pleads poverty as an excuse for being exempted from prosecuting the chief court judgment and decree

25.1.98

The facts asserted in the subjoined petition of the petitioner in the reference in the Mysore State that from the year 1887 the above unit has been doing the above duties as granted by Government order dated 1890 was passed by the Survey Settlement (+ a portion the Bukka Bodge Settlement) was introduced. It is quite possible that the two villages may have been attached & different in this A similar order dated 11th November 1896 was passed by the two-judge also - does not - reserve to the petitioner the permanent advantage contemplated from his circle. If he were under the Rules, the emoluments are payable only & the officiating + Contract to the Contrary seems invalid except in cases provided for in para 59 Rule VIII of the L.R. Rules. The Chief Court judgment has not been received in the Sub Div. Commissioner

28/1/98

Ad 7 Ba.
1-98

1898 (12)

No. 1471

Name of Petitioner Linganna

Village Kemagara

Taluk Anekal

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 3-1-98

Date of Receipt 6-1-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil-

ABSTRACT

Asks reference to Govt. Endorsement no: 365 in respect his petition & 23-9-97, the petitioner states that he is poor to meet the expenses of applying for and securing the copy of the Chief Court judgment, referred to in the endorsement, that there are several other papers filed as exhibits in the records & that there are also papers filed by the clients in the same case & prays that the entire records may be called for from the

Chief Court's orders passed
Early –
CR
20/1/98

46

1898 (4)

From

The Secretary to the Govt.
of Mysore Govt
and Rev Depts

To

The Registrar, Chief
Court of Mysore

L.R. 75-90-14

L.R. 121-97-4

Dated 5

Despatched 7th Feby/98

Received

General No. 738
P. No. 985

Enclosure No.

~~I~~ have the honor to
request that he will be
pleased to forward
for reference a copy of
the judgment of the Chief
Court confirming ~~the~~
~~decree~~ dated the confirming the
Sub-judge of Bangalore
in a civil suit No. 731 of
96-97 on the file of the
Sub-judge's Court —
Subramanya Vs Krishnappa

By order

for Secretary

4/2/98

1898
FEB 26
21/2/98

27

Feb 27th Consulting with AG/S
Order on petn (Several 12)
Pch 1771
21/2/98

Rd. 8 Pm
21/2/98

If there may
also be convenient
situated how
were they joined
in one charge
ascertain the
particulars
submit a note
of the whole case
16.3.98

If I presume that
the Officials is
to be conducted
by counsel
16.3.98

Chief Justice
Supreme Court

17/3/98

No jurisdiction
17/3/98

19.3.98

(14)

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Upyma

&

The Secretary to the
Government of Upyma.

No 4530/36 Dy 9th February 1898.

Sirs,

As requested, forwards
a copy of Order in Civil Revn
Petition No 181 of 1896 Dy with the
file of this Court.

LR 75-90-15
L.R. 121-97-5

11-2-98
Give the Bom Lit and
for the 14/2/98

Previous reply does not belong to present Petn

Send to Bom Lit
14/2/98

Refs sent Dy
15/2/98

Send file
17.2.98

16/2/98 Ch. file is wanted

16/2/98

No 1530
136

48 (14)

Bangalore 9th February 1898.

From

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your no. 7383/986 dated 5th Instant, I have the honor to forward a copy of order in Civil Revision Petition no. 181 of 1896-97 on the file of this Court.

* Subbiramayya
#
Krishnappa

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant,
M Rajasthanam
Registrar.

48

In the Court of Mysore at Bangalore

Friday the 2nd day of April 1897.

Present

Mr Justice J. H. Bell, Chief Judge

and

Mr Justice T. Sreenivasaya, Judge

Civil Revision Petition No 181 of 1896-97.

Krishnappa - Petitioner (Defendant)

(By Mr T. Venkoba Rao)

vs

Subbaramayya - Counter-Petitioner

(absent) (Plaintiff)

Petition against the Decree of the Sirdarjudge of Bangalore in Civil Suit No: 731 of 1896-97

This Petition coming on for hearing this day, the Court pronounced the following

order

Order

The contract was by Plaintiff's father as Chambogue, and with a view to the duties of Chambogue being performed by the Defendant, it being agreed that each should receive half the emoluments. The father has since resigned the Chambogue's office in favor of his own son, the Plaintiff. In these circumstances, the Plaintiff is entitled to maintain this suit.

As the arrangement has been approved by Government, it cannot be held to be against public policy.

Both the objections are therefore invalid, and the Petition is dismissed with costs.

A true copy.

Magistrate's Court

Registrar.

20 Bdy 5833 of

(15) 1895 22-3-98

57

From

The Secretary to Govt
Govt Miscl Revenue Depts

To

The Deputy Commr
Bangalore Dt

A.R 75-98-16

L.R. 121-97-6

Dated 22-3-98.

Despatched 22

Received

General No. 2003 F.
D.F. No. 55-97

(1138)

Enclosure No.

In forwarding herewith petn No 1154 dated 1-11-97 with 2 enclosures, received from Krishnappa Shanbhog & Gumastha of Hennagaralanne in the Anekal Taluk, have the honor to request that he will be so good as to submit a report, in communication with the Survey Superintendent, as to whether the two villages of Hennagaralanne and Bedagere in the Anekal Taluk are still

from

~~based under~~ one

charge and Why they

were formed into one

though so incongruously

Situated as to require

two separate Boards of

for conducting the works. (2) Referred The Dy Comm^r's attention

drawn in this connection to

S^{ri} decision in Appeal

No 1262 of 30/8/91

and communicated to him

in this office No 630/8

P^{ge}

27/8/91.

By order

for Secretary

29.3.28

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 7717
Ref 592
APR 1897
SEWAN'S OFFICE

(16)

5'3

Subject

A 294/98 Draft G 3874/98

Called for a report on the following points besides a fresh report on the Kumsagara petition

1) What is the pay attached to each of the Shanbogs charge, Bidarjere & Hemnagar Kane?

2) Who were registered as Shanbogs of the two charges at the Pukka Polija settlement? & who are the present officiators?

3) If one Shanbog was registered for the two villages — as asserted in his petition — why Sec XXIX of the Polija Rule was not given effect to at the Polija Settlement

4) Would the Dy Commr recommend the continuance of the present arrangement by which half the Polija of Hemnagar Kane is paid to the registered Shanbog who does not do the duties thereof.

The Dy Commr's attention is drawn to Sec XXXVII of the Polija Rule and to the fact that the decision of Govt in A/Appeal No 1262 & 29 Aug 1895 on the Polija Settlement was framed before the Polija Rules were passed

H 30/4/95

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Genl & Rev Departments.

I.R. 75-98

Dated 22nd
Despatched 23rd } April 1898.
Received

General No. I.R. 121-97
No. 1390.

Enclosure No. 1 to file

Secretary's docket No 3001 of 22-26-97

Subject Kumsagara Polija

Communicating the Karnam Subbiah's report that the villages of Hemnagar & Bidarjere in the Anekal Taluk do not form one charge but have always been considered as separate villages.

Petition of 2874/98
Of 6 & 97 relating to the subject is put up

AK
26/4/98

S. C. No 1390

Surplus

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 22nd April 1898.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Gen'l & Rev. Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to refer to your docket No 1008
R.T. 66-97.
of the 22nd March 1898, enquiring whether
the two villages of Hennagarkane, and
Kedargere in the Anepal Taluk form
one charge? I have the honor to for-
ward herewith a copy of docket No 741
of the 18th April 1898, from the Superintendent,
Mysore Revenue Survey, stating that the
villages above referred to do not form
one charge, but have always been
considered as separate villages.

2. The enclosures of the docket un-
der reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Asst. Commissioner in District charge
for Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Recd

1897-98. 55

From

The Superintendent Mysore
Revenue Survey.

To

The Deputy Commissioner of the
Bangalore District.

Dated 18th April 1898.

No 741.

His docket No 1448 of the 9th April 1898.

In returning the correspondence received with the above, has the honor to state that the villages in question were, at no time, made into one charge, but have always been treated as separate villages.

(Signed) J.P. Grant.
Superintendent Mysore
Revenue Survey.

"Copy"

Asstt Commissioner.
in Dist charge.

for Dy Commissioner.
Bangalore Dist

56

(17) 1898

From

The Secretary to Govt
Revl and Agl Depts

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Dated 3d

Despatched 4th May 1898

Received

General No. 10559 P.
F.F. No. 66-97

Enclosure No.

L.R. 121-97-8

L.R. 75-96-68

The Dy Comrs letter No 1390 dated 22nd April 1898 reporting with reference to the appeal of Krishnappa of Hennagarakane village in the Nekal Hl, that the two villages of Hennagarakane and Bidargere in the said Hl do not form one charge but have been considered as separate villages.

In reporting vide Dy Comrs letter No 167 dated 1-11-97 and 8 enclosures returned with the above, for reference and report, has the honor to request that a full report

report may be called on the facts of the case and on all the points urged in the petn besides a clear report on the following points.

(1) what is the polgi attached to each of the Shambhogi charges Bidarguppe and Hennaganakanal

2. who were registered as Shambhogs of the two charges at the Pukka polgi settlement and who are the present office bearers?

3. If one Shambhog was registered for the two villages (as Krishnappa asserts in his petn by grant) why Section XXIX of the Polgi Rules was not given effect to at the Polgi Settlement?

4. Would the Dy Comrs recommend the continuance of the present arrangement by which half the Polgi of Hennaganakanal is paid to the registered Shambhog who does not do the duties thereof.?

The Dy Comrs attention is drawn to section XXVII of the Polgi Rules and to the fact that the decision of Court in Appeal No 1262 dated 10.8.91 was passed before the Polgi Settlement.

By order

for Secretary

3076/89

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
G. No. 296
JUL 17
DEWAN'S OFFICE

1895-97

Put for hearing 5th August
Issue notice
Ex
1917/95

L.R. 75-90-97

L.R. 121-97-9

From
The Dy. Commissioner, of the
Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore.
Genl. & Rev. Department

Dated 12th July 1898.
Despatched 13th July 1898.
Received
General No.
No. 44

Enclosure No 1 file

Sgey's docket dy 10559
Pet. 7. 66-97
of the 4th May 1898.

Reports on petition of
Krishnappa Siddhaling-
-aiya Gumasta of Yennegere Mane
village in the Anekal Taluk
praying that the Siddhaling-
of the said village which is
now in the name of Subrama-
-niya may be registered in
his name.

Petition V

14.7.98

15/7

07 66 97 relating to the
subject in petition

AHC 16/7/98

16/7/98 Sub

D. No. 44
Encl 1 & 2

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 12th July 1898.

To the Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue and General Depts.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 10559
of 66-97
of the 4th May 1898, calling for a
report on the petition of Krishnappa
Shanbhog Pamasta of Hennagarakhane
village in the Docket Taluk, praying
that the Shanbhogi of the said village
which is now in the name of Subramanya
may be registered in his name, I
have the honor to state as follows:—

2. There were two Shanbhogs for
the said village of Hennagarakhane, one
designated "Nagadi Shanbhog" and
the other "Batayi Shanbhog". One
Ramaswamaiya was Nagadi Shanbhog
and the petitioner Krishnappa the
Batayi Shanbhog. Since the office
was thus divided into two, these
two Shanbhogs like their forefathers
before them, had agreed to enjoy
the emoluments of the two offices
in common and they were doing so;

Subsequently, the Patteji system was discontinued and the Vagadi Shanbhog Ramaswamaiya was entrusted with the charge of the above village Besides this, Ramaswamaiya was in charge of another village named Bidargere about 7 or 8 miles from Heanageratkhané. Ramaswami could not have looked after the duties of both the villages without detriment to one of them, and it is not clear why Krishnappa did not then come forward to do the duties of Heanageratkhané himself. However Krishnappa and Ramaswamaiya appointed a Gumasta (named Nanjundaiya who was the Shanbhog of Subramangala) on their behalf to perform the duties of Shanbhog of Heanageratkhané. He acted for some time, but having been found incompetent was dismissed. Ramaswamaiya's eye sight being bad he wanted to get his son Subramaiya appointed as Shanbhog of Heanagera-khane. Krishnappa the petitioner protested against it and prayed

that he might be allowed to do the work himself and agreed to give a share of the patti to Ramasamaiya. But Macintire the then Deputy Commissioner finally ordered that Krishnappa should be appointed as Gumasta for Ramasamaiya. Subramaniya appealed against this decision to Government praying that he may be ordered to do the duties himself or that he may be allowed to appoint a Gumasta. His appeal was dismissed by the Government (Circle Appeal No. 262 dated 25th August 1893). Krishnappa seems to have declined to pay a share in the patti to Subramaniya after the death of Ramasamaiya alleging that he had agreed to give a share only to the latter during his life time and not to his decendants. Thereupon Subramaniya filed a civil suit and obtained a decree for the sum due to him. Against this the petitioner has now preferred an appeal to Government. These

are the facts of the case.

3. Regarding the statement of the petitioner in his appeal to Government, viz. that the Sub Judge has decided that he is only a Gumasta, while he is the registered holder of the office in question, I have to state that although the petitioner is admittedly a joint Hissedar of the office with Subramaniya and his name is registered, the order of the Collector confirmed by Government in 1890 supports the view the Sub Judge in referring to the petitioner as Shanbhag 'Gumasta'. Secondly, the petitioner states that the reason for his refusing to pay any Patgi to Subramaniya is, that the Jambandi and the Patgi calculated thereon at the time he executed the Karar was very much greater than what it is at present, and that consequent on the decrease in the Patgi of the office, he cannot give effect to the Karar. It is clear from paras 2 and 4 of the Amildar's report

N.

No. 110 of the 8th June, 1898 that the jamabandi of the village has now not decreased but increased.

4 The following are the answers to the queries contained in the reference under reply.

(1) The Potgi attached to the Shanbhogi of Hennagaravakkaué is Rs. 10-12-0 and that of Bidargere is Rs. 5-8/-

(2) It is reported that the names of the Shanbhogs are not entered in the Potgi Register received from the Survey Department. Krishnappa, the petitioner, is now doing the duties of the Shanbog of Hennagaravakkaué as Jamastar of Subramanya and the latter is the present Shanbhog of Bidargere.

(3) At the time of the Potgi settlement, there were two separate persons doing the duties of the two villages - Krishnappa of Hennagara-khané and Subramanya of Bidargere. It was probably not thought necessary to give effect to Rule XVIX of the Potgi Rules.

(4)

64

(4) As regards the continuance of the present arrangement, it seems to me, that it is quite opposed to the spirit of the Polgi rules and expressly prohibited by Rules XXVIII. If the present arrangement is allowed to continue, or if Subramaniya is allowed to do the duties of Managerakhané through a Gumasta, it is evident, that he will derive a part of the emoluments of the Shanbhag without doing the work. It therefore seems to me that the petitioner, who is a hakdar, may be appointed as Shanbhog of Managerakhané according to Rule XXIX of the Polgi Rules.

5 The records of the case are herewith submitted

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

W. Elliott Saunders

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Mh

(20)

From

To

The Registrar of the Chief Court of Mysore
Bangalore

Dated 13th

Despatched 13th Sept 1898

Received

General No. 1239 F

F. No. 36-97

(13)

Enclosure No.

A.R. 75-90-20

L.R. 121-97-10

Has the honour to request that the records of Civil Suit No 731 of 1896-97 (Subramanya & Krishnappa) on the file of the Subordinate Judge of Bangalore may be forwarded to this office, as early as possible, for reference in connection with Petn No 865 of 1897-98 (Krishnappa & Subramanya) pending before Court

By Order

Asst Secretary

Draft

13/8/98.

2.5-8-98

Subject in part as

66

24-8-98

Case

Plan mentioned in head of the exhibit

24/8/98

Sub'd 5 1st Counsellor 21-97-11

Before dealing with the case, may the Survey Supt's opinion be called for, especially as the D. Comm'r's remarks & explanation of the Survey Dept. [illegible] of the Survey officials & Rule XXIX of the Rules?

A copy of D. Comm'r's letter no 44 d. 13/7/98 together with the Supt's may be sent to the Survey Supt.

3/9/98

9710

Engd

7/9/98

Draft letter

5/9/98

6/9/98

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—13-9-98.—2,902.

RENEWAL 1235 (Revenue Serial No. 39) DEWAN'S OFFICE

OFFICE OF THE 1482 19-8-98. 1898 DIWAN OF MYSORE

From

The Registrar of the Chief Court of Appeal

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 17-8-98

Despatched 18-8-98

Received August 1898

Enclosures No. Record.

General No. 1150

No. 35

Requested forwards the records in C.A. No 736 of 1897 in the file of the Subordinate Judge of Bangalore.

Rd on 22/8/98

No 1150 Read
35

Bangalore,
1st August 1898.
18

From

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

As requested in your No. 1239 / Pet. 35-97 of the 13th Instant I have the honor to forward herewith the records of Civil Suit No. 731 of 1896-97 on the file of the Civil Judge of Bangalore and to request that they may be returned when no longer required

Subbamanya & Krishnappa.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

Registrar.

Chief

No. 1983. 8.5.98 (22)
P.N. 66-97
From the Secretary to Govt
Land and Rev. Depts

66

To
the Superintendent
of Rev. Survey in
Mysore

L.R. 75-90-22
L.R. 121-97-12

Sir,

In forwarding herewith ⊗ the petition No. 1157 dated 1-11-1897 with 2 enclosures received from Kustuppa of Hennagarakere in the Chikballa, and a copy of the Bangalore Deputy Commr's report thereon No. 44 dated 12th July 1898, I am directed to request you to be so good as to favor Govt with your opinion on the matter at an early date. And ch. I have &c.

for Secretary

8/8/98

⊗ to the obliging returned

Report as to why at the Nilji Settlement separate Shambogues were not appointed for the two hobblis.

Gen. 30.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Cir. No. 3605
DEC 6 1898
Dept. No. 217
DEPUTY SECRETARY

1898

From The Supt. Mysore Rev. Survey

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore. Genl & Rev Depts.

Dated 6th December 1898
Despatched
Received

Enclosure No. 2

General No. 379
No.

In reply to No 1983 / Pet J.66-97 of 9th Sept/98

SUBJECT

Replying to letter No 1983 / Pet J.66-97 dated 9th September 1898 and giving opinion on petition No 1151 of 1st November 1897, regarding Shanbogship of the village of Hemagarkhane Anekal Taluk

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Pet 7.12.98

Rec'd 8/12

No 379

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 6th December
1898

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Gen and Rev Depts.

Sir,

In returning Petition
No 1151 dated 1st November 1897
with its two enclosures, received
with your letter No 1983 / Pet 766-97 dated
9th September 1898, now under
reply, I have the honor to offer
the following remarks

2. I am asked to report, —
more especially, why, at the —
Potgi settlement, separate —
Shanboga —

Shanbags were not appointed
for the two Pirkas. If by this I
am to understand that the two
Pirkas mean Nagadi and Battay
portions of the village of Heman-
=gartikare respectively I reply
that such separation was not
to impossible even had the matter
been brought to the notice of the
Department The village of
Hemagartikare was constituted
a distinct charge and it was the
duty of the Deputy Commissioner
not of this Department to
appoint an Officiator.

Head of
Inapplicable
crossed by Commr
in the proof

3 To me it appears that the
course to have adopted from the
first should have been to appoint
Krishnappa who was admitted to
be

be a Native, because, under Polyg Rule XXIV, Ramasawmy having another village of which he was Officiator, would have to give up Hannagarkhane.

4 I quite agree with the Deputy Commissioner in considering the present arrangements to be opposed to the Polyg Rules and in thinking that the petitioner Krishnappa should be appointed Officiator of Hannagarkhane.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

G Grant

Supt. Mysore Res: Survey

73

L.R. 121-97-14

3 Draft 8

1898

75

From

The Secretary to Govt
Rev & Agri Depts

To

The Registrar Chief
Court

Dated 21st

Despatched 25 Jany 99.

Received

General No. 1946
No. 66-97

Enclosure No. 1 File Statement in book form.

L.R. 121-97-15

L.R. 75-98-25

The Registrar's No. 1180/35
dated the 17th August 98

Has the honour to return herewith the records in C.S. No. 731 of 26.97 on the file of the Sub Judge of Bangalore, received with the above

By order

for Secretary

25

Printed with
receipt dated
25/1/99

(30)

3 Drafts

Proceedings of the Court of Resident

Appellant — Krishnappa — Vs — Respondent — Subramanya

Read:-

Petition No 865 of 23-9-97 presented by Krishnappa Shanbhog Gramastha of Hemmagarakere village in the Anekal Taluk, praying for the registering of the village in his name and complaining that his appeal against the Sub-Judge's decree directing him to pay half the patagi to the Registrar was rejected by the Chief Court

2 Correspondence ending with letter No 44 of 12-7-98 from the Deputy Commr Bangalore District.

3. Letter No 379 of 6-12-98 from the Supt of Revenue Survey in Mysore

4. The records of the case.

5. The records of Civil Suit No 731 of 96-97 (Subramanya vs Krishnappa) on the file of the Sub-Judge of Bangalore

The facts of the case are as follows:-

Prior to the abolition

Draft for approval
Asst to Supt Commdr
6/1/99

L.R 25-30-96
L.R: 121-97-16

10406

Issue temp
Drawings for Hall
to be open

7/1/99

Supt & 2nd Commdr

7/1/99

Rly. Board.
9.1.99

Approved
15.1.99

Redraft. Kannada
in accordance with
Supt's note
9/1/99

of the Balāji system, there were two Shanbhags for Hemmigankere village, the appellant being the Balāji Shanbhag and Ramanna (the respondent's father) the Nigadi Shanbhag. On the abolition of the balāji system, Ramanna was made the sole Officiator of Hemmigankere but being also the Shanbhag of Bidarguppe performed his duties by a gumasta

In 1937 the gumasta was dismissed for incompetency and the appellant was appointed instead.

In 1940 the respondent appealed to Govt against this order but the appeal was rejected on the grounds that he could not be allowed to have charge of both the villages and that Kariyappa had agreed to pay half the salary to Ramanna, the respondent's father

18

4 The appellant having on the death of Ramanadai refused to pay any portion of the patej to the respondent, the latter brought a suit in the Sub Judge's Court at Bangalore and obtained a decree in his favor. The Chief Court having affirmed this decree, Krishnappa prays for registry of the Shanbhag's in his name as he is a hakdar.

Cases: Sp 40½-45 of 1900-01 1/8

On the introduction of the patej settlement, it was the duty of the Dy Comr to have appointed an Officer for each firka constituted as such by the Survey Dept. The neglect of this has led to the present unsatisfactory state of affairs.

2 Hemagarkare and Bidargu are separate firkas and are 8 miles distant from

each case. The appellant who is admittedly one of the hakdars will be appointed sole Shanbhag of Nemnagar Khane in accordance with the Rule XXIX of the Policy Rules

Dept

Secretary

To

The Accountant-General
with records

Dept of Revenue

1 Copy with records to A.G. Bangalore
1 - do - without records to Survey Supdt

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 25.1.99.

Upc

2.5.99.

38

338 of 98 Call for the records & 87 & 88 Inwr

2.5.99 Ord 66 of 97 relating to the Shanbhogship of Hemagere Village Chitkal Tq is patterp Please see Lar 20 24 for the ext. upd to in the Ords

J.R. 121-97-17
J.R. 75-90-27

2/5/99.

Subd

1/ Two Rs Stamps affixed Stamp Dfft

2/ This is an application for review by the Respdt of the Shanbhogs Ord in Case No 49 of 96-97 dtd 19th January 1899 (Photo) No 805 / 338 of 98 In time

MM 1/5/99 Refer to 2nd Councillor AR 6/5/99

RD 7/5/99

Case upon the Dfft Shanbhogs a distant relation of the Worshipful Mr Hotchkiss Member in charge of Revenue and Municipal matters. Would it be well to take the Hon Member's opinion on the Dfft's application before we proceed to dispose of the case?

9.5.99

Draft order

AR 9/5/99

DS 12/5/99

(29) 1897

No. 121/75.

Name of Petitioner Subbaraudiar. Khane Shanbhog.

Village Hemagara.

Taluk Anekal.

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 28-4-99

Date of Receipt 2-5-

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 1.

Appellant Subbaramiah

Respondent Krishnappa

ABSTRACT

This is a petn for Review of Govt order in 338 of 98 on the following grounds:— That the Hemagarakere Shanbhogi is divided into two, Balagi & Nagadigal; that the Respdt was Balagi Shanbhog which being abolished 3 years ago, he was enjoying only the Balagi Rights, without doing any work; that the Appt was Nagadigal Shanbhog & was getting the work done by means of a Gumasta who being found unfit, the Govt ordered the work to be done by Respdt as Gumasta.

2. That the question that Respdt is only a Gumasta is already decided by Govt Endt No 1262 9/6-8-91.

3. That Section 29 of Polyé Rules does not apply in the Relts case, for the Relts has no other Shanbhagi but that of Honnagaraking, the Bidaragere Shanbhagi belongs to his sister & her another-in-law who having no issue have asked the Relts to look after the work, which may be taken away from him whenever the above women wish, So the Relts has only the Honnagara Shanbhagi to depend upon.

4. That on the contrary the above Section fully applies in the case of the Respdt, for he is already the Shanbhag of two charges, Consisting of Sidanayakanahalli, Hanakki & Kastenahalli village, Sadey giving this charge also he will be the Shanbhag of 3 charges, whereas the Relts will have none.

5. That according to Govt Proceedings No 2349 dt 7-5-92, Govt, instead of restoring the above Shanbhagi to the Relts & asking the Respdt to bring a regular case, have ordered the change of registry from the Relts to the Respdt name who is only a Gumasta.

For the above reasons and many others which he will tell in person, Prays that an Hrg may be given him & the Shanbhagi retained in his name alone.

Enc-1. Govt order No 338 dt 19-1-93

Certs that as this order received him on 31-1-93 this is not barred by limitation. 3/2-5-93.

ضلع [illegible] - تحصیل [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible]

1. [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible]

---

2. [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible]

---

3. [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible] - [illegible]

ڈھکنے والے کپڑے کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کے بعد ہر ایک کا الگ الگ ذکر ہے۔ پہلے
کرتے کا ذکر ہے۔ کرتا عربی میں قمیص کہلاتا ہے۔ اس کی جمع قمصان
آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد ازار کا ذکر ہے۔ ازار عربی میں تہبند کو کہتے ہیں۔
اس کی جمع ازر آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد عمامہ کا ذکر ہے۔ عمامہ سر پر باندھنے
کی پگڑی کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع عمائم آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد خف کا ذکر
ہے۔ خف چمڑے کا موزہ ہوتا ہے۔ اس کی جمع خفاف آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد
نعل کا ذکر ہے۔ نعل جوتے کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع نعال آتی ہے۔
اس کے بعد سیف کا ذکر ہے۔ سیف تلوار کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع سیوف
آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد رمح کا ذکر ہے۔ رمح نیزہ کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع
رماح آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد قوس کا ذکر ہے۔ قوس کمان کو کہتے ہیں۔
اس کی جمع اقواس آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد سہم کا ذکر ہے۔ سہم تیر کو کہتے
ہیں۔ اس کی جمع سہام آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد درع کا ذکر ہے۔ درع زرہ کو
کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع دروع آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد ترس کا ذکر ہے۔ ترس
ڈھال کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع اترس آتی ہے۔ اس کے بعد مغفر کا ذکر
ہے۔ مغفر لوہے کی ٹوپی کو کہتے ہیں۔ اس کی جمع مغافر آتی ہے۔

28.4.55.

Q.C

(30)

1899

From

The Secretary to Govt
& General and Rev. Depts

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Dated 15th

Despatched 15th May/99.

Received

General No. 8357/1

Jr. No. 66-97

(36)

Enclosure No.

In forwarding herewith petn no 1743 dated 28-4-99, received from Subramaniah of Hennagaratane in the Malad Taluk, praying for revision of Govt order no 4944-45 dated 21-1-99, Jr. 66-97 I have the honor to request that he will be so good as to submit a detailed report as to whether the petr has a charitable village of his own or not and if not, whether the Govt order now objected to by petr will leave him without any charge at all as alleged by him

C2
9/6/99

By order
[illegible]
12/5/99

12/6/99 for Secretary

(8) with its one enclosure
(to be obligingly returned)

L.R. 121-97-19

93

according he regularly
paid the amount for some
years; that, thereafter, the
petitioner got the Shan-
bhoji registry made in
the name of his son Subba
Ramia; that on the latter's
petition to file and to
the Dy Collr praying for
permission to discharge
the duties himself, orders
were passed on 18-8-91
27
to the effect that as the
Sumasta had been regula-
rly paying the Mirasi accord-
ing to the agreement and
also as Subbaramia
had the shanbhoji office
of a different village
Bidaregere, the Sumasta
could not be ousted
of his place; that the said
Sumasta being prejudiced
discontinued the payment
of the Mirasi for a year or
two, whereupon he was

sued in a Civil Court and
a decree was obtained
against him; that, thereafter,
the said Jumasta petitioned
to have praying for the
registry being made in his
name, whereupon orders
were passed on 21-1-99 (?)
to the effect that the present
petitioner had died, that
the Jumasta be made the
registrar and the name
of the original registrar
be removed.

Petitioner prays that the
said order be set aside
and the original order
of 16-8-97 be restored
27
confirming the registry
in the original registrar's
name.

24-10-99

24-10-99

Date of stamp application

26-10-99

Date of delivery of stamp

Date of delivery of copy
26.10.99

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(438)

Pet
S.66-97 P2 (34) 16-11-99.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition.
Registered No. 8387 dated 15-11-99
received at the Dewan's Office from
Ramaraiah of Bidarapore Hobli
Taluk, praying ~~[illegible]~~ for
review of ~~[illegible]~~ dated 10-11-97

~~A.R. 75-10-32~~
A.R. 121-97-21

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner
of the Bangalore District,
~~for disposal~~ in continuation of
his docket No: 8387
of 15-5-98
and
with a request that he will be
so good as to expedite his report
called for therein

DO

By order,

for Secretary.

BANGALORE,
14-11-1899

16
17

(35)

Rt 808

189 9-1900

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Revenue Department

Dated 20th
Despatched 22nd } March 1900
Received

General No. 97-22
Dy No. 902

Enclosure No. 1 Five
Pages dated the 55-1
00-27
the 15th May 1899, Memorandum
No. Pet
T. 66-97 of the 16th November 1899
Reports regarding the Shan-
-bhogs of the Yennagarahalli
in the Kasaba Taluk -

Subd Rev C^r E D^r

M/ The pet^r applies, for a
29. 7. 00 review of Gov^t O^d 21/1/99 (Sns
46, Open Pls) on the ground that
the order deprived him of the only Shanbogi fitha, the main
& Kadi-Biranike fitha which
is stated in the Govt order that
his was not his.

The Dy Comm^r who was called upon
to report on the above allegation
states that the bit^s of
respective as Shanbogs & Biranike
in 1893-94.

The postal forwarder is whether
the pet's allegation being opposed
to facts, his review application
may be rejected

4/4/00
201

Dy 2/4/00

Subd by St-C^r
Dy 31/8/00

R2 6.45 P.M
31. VIII. 00

Yes - the petitioner's
allegations are found
to be false. Petitioner
is therefore entitled
to be rejected under
S. IX. 00

Pdn
26-8-00

Rect
27/3 Of 66 of 97 containing papers
as per cover

All
27/3/900.

D. No. 902
Ear. file

[illegible] District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 20th March 1899.

To Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Revenue & General Department.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 8351/66-97 dated 15th May 1899, and Reminder No. Rev. 766-97 dated 3rd November 1899, calling for a report regarding the Shankarapatte Hanumegowdakaval in the Anekal Taluk, I have the honor to state that from the Amildar's Karnamee Report No. 96 of the 15th September 1899, herein enclosed, it will be seen that Ramanaick, for whom Patte Jagirdar, Subbanaick, has sent the report

Shankaraf

Skandhaf of Bidarkere, lenbody officated as Skandhaf Gumasta of the village for his father-in-law Subbaraya from the year 1864 His Subbaraya having died some years back leaving no issues on the male side, his daughter's son, Subbaramiah the petitioner, was in 1893-94 appointed Skandhaf of Bidarkere and registered as such. He is accordingly now doing the Skandhagi of this village which carries a Patagi allowance of Rs. 60/- a year.

2 It will thus be seen that by conferring the Skandhagi of Gumastakané on Subbaramiah the petitioner Subbaramiah

will

will not be left without a Sam-
thoji Charge in his own name,
as he will remain in possession
of the Vidwathere Shanthoji
Seale which he inherited from
his maternal grandfather.

5. The vernacular Correspondence
bearing on the subject of the letter
with the petitioners received with
the docket under reference are
returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

P. Sitaramiah

for Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

(36)

L.R 121-97-23

L.R 75-90-24

4944-45

P.7.66-97

[illegible]

By Order

[illegible]

for Secretary

Pt [illegible] 3-11-1900

(813)

"Copy of the above is ~~[illegible]~~ is forwarded to the A/Com: Bangalore Dist: for information together with the letter received with his letter No. A. 502 of 22/22 March 1900.

By Order

[illegible]

for Secretary.

Reference
24.12.01

169 1900 - R. 7455-2-97-13

1061

24/12

3-1-02

Sd 4.1.02

Sd 3/1/02

3/1/02

L.R. 3/4

L.R. 25-9-35

Sd 4.1.02

Petr is unable to find the boundaries of his land in this case & that the pattas of his two lands alone his adjoining lands have been obtained

Sd 4/1/02

Office Book
9/1/02

(39)

1901

No. 1554

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamiah

Village Kirangere

Taluk Anekal

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 11-12-01

Date of Receipt 12-12-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

The petitioner states that Krishnappa, Sambaya gumasta of Veerangarakkane, had sent a petition praying for the cancellation of the lease executed by him for the lands of the petitioner and that Venkatappa the Patel, and two respectable persons as the Amaldar; that the first petition was dismissed, and consequently ordered that the Shanbhag should be restored in the name of Krishnappa; and

on 16-10-1873 the (petitioner)
submitted a petition to Court
in Chambers.

Etc prays for early orders
on the above petition

Read
20/12/01

& Serial No 8
31 of Index
File

1864

151

MYSORE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REGD. NO. ...
DATE ...

To

The Chief Commissioner of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

I have the honor to submit the following petition for your favorable consideration.

Petition of Sri Venkatarama Shastri, Sri Subbaraya Shastri and Sri Ramaswamy Shastri, sons of late Sri Lakshmipathi Shastri, Vedic Scholars, residing in Kolar.

That our father Sri Lakshmipathi Shastri was a Vedic Scholar of great repute and was in receipt of a Sarvamanya Agrahara village Kasaba in Kolar Taluk, Kolar District, granted by the Maharaja of Mysore, and that he was in possession of the same till his death in 1891. That after his death, we, his sons, have been in possession of the said village and enjoying the income therefrom. That the said village was resumed by the Government in the year 1862 and that we have been receiving a pension of Rs. 30 per month in lieu thereof. That we have been receiving the said pension from the Government Treasury in Kolar. That we have been receiving the said pension from the Government Treasury in Kolar. That we have been receiving the said pension from the Government Treasury in Kolar

మీరు నా కార్య మంత్రిత్వ శాఖలో, చెల్లి ఆఫీసులో కొన్ని
రకాల ఉద్యోగాలు చేయడానికి మీకు ఆసక్తి ఉన్నట్లయితే
సంబంధిత అధికారులు, నా స్నేహితులు తమకి చేయమని కోరే
నిన్న నా వద్దకు వచ్చారు. ఈ ఉద్యోగాలకి అర్హులు అయిన వారి
పేరు మీ పేర్లు ఉన్నట్లు తెలిసింది. అందుకు మీరు ఎలాంటి
సమాధానం ఇవ్వలేదు. అందుకే మీ అభిప్రాయం తెలుసుకోవడానికి
ఈ ఉత్తరం వ్రాస్తున్నాను. ఈ ఉద్యోగాలు మీకు ఇష్టమైతే నన్ను
చూడటానికి వచ్చినప్పుడు చెప్పండి. ఒకవేళ మీకు ఇష్టం లేకపోతే
ఉద్యోగాలు కావాలని ఎవరికీ చెప్పకండి. నన్ను మాత్రం మీ
ఇష్టం వచ్చినప్పుడు వచ్చి కలవండి. ఇట్లు మీ
గత సంవత్సరం నాగపూర్ లో 1871 లో మొదలైన
ఆ శాఖ 16 లో మన రాష్ట్రంలోకి వచ్చింది. ఈ
ఆ శాఖలో కొన్ని చోట్ల మాత్రం చిన్నపాటి ఉద్యోగాలు
మీకు కావాలంటే ఆ ఉద్యోగాలు మీకు ఇప్పించగలను. నన్ను
ఆ ఉద్యోగాలలో ఎవరినైనా నియమించమని మీరు
అభ్యర్థించవచ్చు.

11-10-1901.

(40)

ನಂ. 1864

ಹುಜೂರು ದಿವಾಣ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

17-1-1902

ಆಜೀಜಾದಾರ ಆ ದಿನ್ ಲ್ಲಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಂಡಿಪೆಂಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಹುಕುಂ

ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿರುವ ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇಂಡಿಪೆಂಡೆನ್ಸ್ ಹುಕುಂ ಕೊಡಲು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 11—10—1901 ನೇ ಮುಕ್ಕುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮೇಲ್ಕಾ ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿದ 11—10—1901 ನೇ ಮುಕ್ಕುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮೇಲ್ಕಾ ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದು

ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಂ. 1743 ನೇ ಹುಕುಂ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರೆಯಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಳವಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಇತಿ ತಾರೀಖು 9 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಫೆ ನ ವ ರಿ ಸನ್ 1902 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ದರಖಾಸ್ತು

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು. ಸಹಿ

By Order,

Secretary.